

The Motion is DENIED in that the Court declines to strike Doc. No. 11. The Court notes, though, that the contents of Doc. No. 11 proved to gain Plaintiff nothing and that the Court has disregarded any such content that could be considered “immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous.”

Eli Richardson

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

BROOKS AUTOMATION US, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:24-CV-1284

Judge Richardson

**MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF’S RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT’S REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

Defendant Brooks Automation US, LLC (hereinafter “Defendant”) respectfully moves this Court to strike Plaintiff Jane Doe’s (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) Response to Defendant’s Request for Extension of Time (hereinafter “Response”). Plaintiff’s Response not only fails to articulate any legitimate basis for denying Defendant’s Motion, but separately, it contains immaterial, impertinent, false, and highly inflammatory allegations, and scandalous material, none of which have any relevance to Defendant’s underlying motion.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On October 28, 2024, Plaintiff filed her Complaint (Compl., ECF No. 1) together with a Motion to Proceed Under Pseudonym and to Seal Exhibits and Sensitive Complaint Information (Mot. to Proceed Under Pseudonym, ECF No. 2). Plaintiff’s Complaint, inclusive of the attached exhibits, surpasses one-hundred fifty pages. Defendant received a copy of the Complaint on November 1, 2024, and the current deadline to respond to the Complaint is today, November 22, 2024. On November 12, 2024, Defendant requested an extension of time, to and including December 23, 2024, to respond to Plaintiff’s voluminous Complaint (Def.’s Mot. for Extension of